

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 1, 2007 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 61-67 have been added. Claims 2-8, 13, 16, 18-23, 30-35, 37, and 38 have been amended. Support for the new claims and the amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed. Claims 9-12, 26, 28, and 39-60 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Withdrawal of the pending rejections and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Objection to specification

At page 3 of the Office Action the specification is objected to because terms used in claims 39, 40, 43, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, and 60 allegedly lack support in the specification. Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, claims 39, 40, 43, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, and 60 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Objection to drawings

At page 4 of the Office Action the drawings are objected to because terms used in claims 39, 40, 43, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, and 60 allegedly lack support in the drawings. Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, claims 39, 40, 43, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, and 60 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C Section 112

At pages 5-7 of the Office Action independent claims 39, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, and 60, as well as the claims dependent thereon, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112. These independent claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the claims dependent thereon have been amended to depend from one of the newly added claims. Accordingly, the Section 112 rejections are obviated. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Section 112 rejections be withdrawn and the claims reconsidered.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C Section 103

At page 8 of the Office Action claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,636,873 to Carini in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,188,332 to

Charisus in view of “Principles of Object Oriented Analysis and Design, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,670 to Lindsay. At page 9 of the Office Action, claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Carini, Charisus, and Martin in view of US. Patent No. 5,604,906 to Murphy. At page 10 of the Office Action claims 19, 39, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Carini and Charisius in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,200 to Eager. At page 14, claims 2-9, 12, 13, 37, 38, 40-44, 53, 54, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Carini in view of Charisius. At page 21 of the Office Action, claims 26, 30-34, 45-50, 52, 56-58, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Carini, Charisius, and Martin. At page 27 of the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 14, 16-18, 20-24, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Carini, Charisius and Eager.

As explained above, claims 9-12, 26, 28, and 39-60 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the claims dependent on the cancelled claims have been amended to depend from one of the new claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejections of the claims have been obviated. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Section 103 rejections be withdrawn and the claims reconsidered.

New Claims 61-67

Claims 61-67 have been added. These claims recite elements not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. To illustrate, claim 61 recites “a mobile data model generator configured to create a first mobile data model including a first set of classes and a second mobile data model, the first set of classes including some but not all of an available set of classes in an enterprise data store, the second set of classes including some but not all of an available set of classes in the enterprise data store, the second set of classes different from the first” and “a mobile messenger application configured to receive first data transactions associated with the first mobile data store and to alter the first mobile data store based on the first data transactions.” These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example, Carini discloses a system for synchronizing mobile devices with a replication database. *Carini*, Abstract and FIG. 4. To synchronize the mobile devices, the replication database provides data snapshots to the mobile devices. *Id.*, col.7, lines 21-35. However, as illustrated in Carini, FIG. 4, each replication database used to synchronize the mobile devices *is the same*. Accordingly, assuming *arguendo* that the replication database is based on a mobile data model, it is based on a

single mobile data model. Accordingly, Carini necessarily fails to disclose or suggest a first mobile data model and a second mobile data model different from the first. Further, none of the remaining cited references disclose this feature. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of new claim 61.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

August 1, 2007

Date

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)